DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 364 40 EC 004 750

AUTHOR	Scholl, Geraldine T.
TITLE	Development of Self-Study Instruments for Use in Accrediting. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-8023
PUB DATE	Jul 69
GRANT	OEG-0-8-088023-3633(032)
NOTE	58p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.00
DESCRIPTORS	Accreditation (Institutions), Evaluation Methods, *Exceptional Child Research, *Program Evaluation, *Residential Schools, Self Evaluation, *Visually Handicapped

ABSTRACT

To evaluate the Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools as an instrument for self-study which precedes the actual accreditation process, a staff reaction form was utilized in five schools for the blind. The reaction form consisted of information on the individual responding, his reaction to the total Guide, and his reaction to specific sections of the Guide. A total of 275 inquiries (85.4%) were returned with the following results: the Guide was considered deficient as a mechanism for describing programs for the multiply handicapped and for describing the role of houseparents in the school program; certain schools encountered difficulties in adapting the context of the Guide to their individual situation; but overall the Guide was found to be appropriate and useful for describing programs. Appendixes include the forms used, and tables present specific data collected. (Author/JM)

PA-40
BR-8-8023
OE/BEH

ED034364

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 8-8023
Grant No. OEG-O-8-088023-3633 (032)

Development of Self-study Instruments For Use In Accrediting

Geraldine T. Scholl
National Accreditation Council
84 Fifth Avenue
Suite 501
New York, N.Y. 10011

EC 004 750

July 1969

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

U.S. Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ED034364

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report

Project No. 8-8023
Grant No. OEG-0-8-088023-3633 (032)

Development of Self-Study Instruments for Use in Accrediting

Geraldine T. Scholl
National Accreditation Council for Agencies
Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped
84 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

July, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent offical position of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

U. S. Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the contribution of members of the Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services to the success of the project. This committee was appointed by the Commission on Accreditation of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped. Under the able leadership of its chairman, Dr. Jack Birch, this committee offered helpful suggestions for improving the early draft of the Guide, facilitated the planning and execution of the project, and, most of all, assisted in the preparation of this report. In innumerable ways, individually and collectively, the members gave guidance and support to the author.

Thanks are also due to the loyal and dedicated administrators and staff members of the five schools who participated in the evaluation portion of the project. These administrators and their staffs, already deeply involved in conducting self-studies of their schools, gave hundreds of additional hours to the research project. They are listed here in grateful recognition of their contribution: J. M. Woolly, Superintendent, Arkansas School for the Blind; Herbert J. Wolfe, Superintendent, The Maryland School for the Blind; D. W. Overbeay, Superintendent, Ohio State School for the Blind; Charles C. Woodcock, Superintendent, Oregon State School for the Blind; and Edward J. Waterhouse, Director, Perkins School for the Blind. Their suggestions were invaluable for improving the content of the present Guide and are reflected in the addenda included with this report. The next edition of the Guide will be better as a result of the time and effort they devoted to completing the evaluation instrument.

Finally, the author is grateful to the special consultant on the project, Dr. William T. Bean, Associate Executive Secretary, Commission on Secondary Schools, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; to Charles I. Sheldon, Assistant Executive Director, National Accreditation Council, who served as Project Coordinator; and all staff members of the National Accreditation Council for their attention to the innumerable and irksome details that attend the conduct of any project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements		ii
List of Tables		iv
Summary		1
Chapter		
I	Introduction	3
II	The Development of the Guide	4
	Resource Materials	4
	Description of the Guide	5
	Review of the Guide	8
III	Evaluation of the Guide: Method	9
	Selection of Schools	9
	Development of the Staff Reaction Form	9
	Procedure	9
IV	Results and Discussion	11
	Description of the Respondents	11
	Evaluation of the Total Guide	15
	Evaluation of Specific Sections of the Guide	18
V	Conclusions and Recommendations	25
References		27
Bibliography		28
Appendices		
A	Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services	30
B	Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools: Table of Contents	31
C	Staff Reaction Form	32
D	Progress Report Form	40
E	D-20: Other Course or Program	41
F	Supplement to Section A	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Per cent Return of Staff Reaction Forms	11
2.	Role of Respondents	12
3.	Formal Education of Respondents	13
4.	Certification of Teacher Respondents	13
5.	Experience of Respondents	14
6.	Knowledge of Total Program of the School Before and After the Self-Study	15
7.	Familiarity of Respondents with the Total Guide	16
8.	Usefulness and Accuracy of the Guide in Describing a School's Program	17
9.	Evaluation of Mechanics of the Guide	18
10.	Evaluation of "Guiding Principles": Curricular Sections	20
11.	Evaluation of "Guiding Principles": Non-curricular Sections	20
12.	Evaluation of "Checklists": Curricular Sections	22
13.	Evaluation of "Checklists": Non-curricular Sections	23
14.	Evaluation of "Evaluations": Curricular Sections	23
15.	Evaluation of "Evaluations": Non-curricular Sections	24

SUMMARY

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped as an instrument for the self-study which precedes the visit of an on-site review team in the accreditation process. The development of the Guide was a further step in implementing the work of the Commission on Standards for Accreditation of Services for the Blind (COMSTAC). Since the content for this Guide was adapted primarily from instruments currently used by the regional accrediting agencies for secondary schools and by the National Catholic Education Association, an evaluation of its applicability for educational programs conducted by residential schools for the visually handicapped was necessary.

Five residential schools were selected for the study. Staff members in each school utilized the Guide while the school engaged in the self-study process. Following the self-study, staff members completed an evaluation instrument developed to elicit reactions to the various sections of the Guide. Responses were received from 275 or 85.4 per cent of staff members in the five schools. The nineteen curriculum sections of the Guide were evaluated by a total of 406 staff members with evaluations from an average of 21.4 respondents per section; the six remaining sections were evaluated by a total of 131 staff members with an average of 21.8 per section.

Analysis of the data showed that the overall reaction to the Guide was strongly favorable. A supplement to the Manual of Instructions of the Guide was prepared incorporating suggestions from the respondents regarding more effective utilization of the Guide for the self-study. The need for an all-purpose section for courses or programs that cannot be described accurately by other sections of the Guide was identified and met by developing a new section. These two supplements comprise the addenda to the Guide for future users until such time as a new edition is prepared. In general, results from the study demonstrated the effectiveness of the Guide as a useful tool in describing the program of residential schools for the visually handicapped for the self-study required in the accreditation process.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

In October 1966 the Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind (COMSTAC) predecessor of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, completed its charge to develop standards in five areas of administration and seven fields of service. More than one hundred leaders representing twenty professional fields were involved in this monumental task. The publication of these standards in THE COMSTAC REPORT: Standard for Strengthened Services (1965) represented a major thrust forward in the direction of improving services to blind and visually handicapped persons.

The next step in this process was to develop instruments based on the standards delineated in THE COMSTAC REPORT for each service area. These instruments would serve as guides for the self-study undertaken by agencies and schools applying for accreditation from the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped. For one of the seven fields of service, education, it was evident that more than one self-study guide would be necessary. Educational programs for the visually handicapped include residential schools and varying patterns of day school programs. Instruments appropriate to these different settings are needed.

The instrument for residential schools was selected first for development because (1) the program of such schools usually occurs in a single, self-contained setting, (2) residential schools are identified with the field of services to the blind, and (3) interest in applying for accreditation was expressed by many administrators of these schools. In addition, it seemed likely that residential schools would be seeking accreditation from the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, whereas community school programs may tend to be accredited as part of a larger unit, that is, an entire school or school system, by one of the regional accrediting agencies for education. The procedure for the development of the self-study instrument for residential schools is described in Chapter II.

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of this instrument for describing the varying programs of residential schools during self-study, which precedes the visit of an on-site review team in the accreditation process.

Chapter II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GUIDE

The Commission on Accreditation of the National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped appointed an Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services to work with the project director in the development and evaluation of the self-study instrument for residential schools. Members of this committee are listed in Appendix A. At the initial meeting of the committee on August 10,1967, it was decided that the project director would prepare a draft of the instrument from available resource materials. This draft would be reviewed at the October meeting of the committee prior its publication for use by schools.

Resource Materials

Several instruments are currently used in the process of accreditation by various agencies. The following were considered most relevant for residential schools:

1. Evaluative Criteria (National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 1960). This document is utilized by most regional agencies charged with accrediting secondary schools in making evaluations for accreditation. It is a familiar document to most secondary school personnel.

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools (NCEA, 1965). This instrument was developed by the National Catholic Educational Association for evaluation of Catholic elementary schools.

3. A.A.M.D. Self-Evaluation Instruments (A.A.M.D., 1966). These instruments were developed by the American Association on Mental Deficiency, Division of Special Studies, Institutional Evaluation Project, to provide a means for evaluating services for state residential institutions for the mentally retarded. The instruments were based on standards developed during a special project conducted by the American Association on Mental Deficiency (A.A.M.D., 1964).

4. Standards for Services of Child Welfare Institutions (Child Welfare League of America, 1964). This document describes standards developed by the Child Welfare League of America to evaluate residential aspects of institutions serving children.

All of these instruments are used for evaluation and/or accreditation by various organizations. Evaluative Criteria and Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools were specifically endorsed by the Committee on Standards for Education of the Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind in preparing the education section of THE COMSTAC REPORT.

Using the standards outlined for education in THE COMSTAC REPORT, the draft of the self-study instrument was prepared by selecting from the above resource documents those portions which were relevant for describing residential programs for the education of the visually handicapped. The general format of Evaluative Criteria was adopted.

Description of the Guide

The Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools (NAC, 1968b) consists of a manual of procedures, twenty-seven sections to describe various aspects of the school's program, an individual staff member information form, and an evaluation summary and report. A copy of the Table of Contents for the Guide may be found in Appendix B. The following summarizes resources utilized in preparing the various sections of the Guide.

Section A: The purpose of the "Manual of Procedures" is to present background information, recommendations, and suggestions for using the Guide in making the self-study prior to an on-site review. The "Manual of Procedures" draws on background material from THE COMSTAC REPORT and includes content common to the other guides published by the National Accreditation Council, namely, Self-Study and Evaluation Guide (NAC, 1968a) and Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Sheltered Workshops (NAC, 1968c). Appropriate material was also included from Evaluative Criteria and Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools.

Section B: "Philosophy and Objectives" — the purpose of this section is to provide the framework for developing a meaningful statement of philosophy and objectives. The development of a statement of philosophy and objectives is one of the most important aspects in the self-study, since the evaluation of all activities both curricular and non-curricular is based in part on the extent to which these activities are consistent with the purposes and objectives as defined and agreed upon by the staff of the school. Comparable sections in the resource documents were reviewed. However, since weaknesses were noted in each, this section was prepared specifically for this Guide.

Section C: "School and Community Profile" was adapted from Evaluative Criteria and Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools. Additional tables were developed for recording information about student characteristics unique to visually handicapped, such as data on vision of the students and the presence of other disabilities. In preparing this section staff members may elect to present data statistically in tables prepared for this purpose or to describe in narrative form the material requested.

From Evaluative Criteria the following curriculum sections were adapted with minor modifications:D-3: "Business Education," D-4: "Core Program," D-6: "Distributive Education," D-8: "English Language Arts (Secondary)," D-11: "Home Economics," D-12: "Industrial Arts," and D-19: "Vocational Trade and Industrial Education." Although D-4: "Core Program" included in Evaluative Criteria is not used extensively by secondary schools seeking accreditation from the regional accrediting agencies, it was decided to adapt and retain it because the smaller secondary programs in residential schools tend to be self-contained and organized along the lines of the core program. D-7: "English Language Arts (Elementary," was adapted from Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools with minor modifications.

Sections devoted to curriculum areas that span the elementary and secondary years were developed by combing content from both Evaluative Criteria and Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools into a single section, thus providing an opportunity for schools to study their offerings in these curricular areas on a continuum. These sections included: D-9: "Foreign Languages," D-10: "Health Education," D-13: "Mathematics," D-14: "Music," D-16: "Physical Education," D-17: "Science," and D-18: "Social Studies." An exception was made in English Language Arts were both an elementary and secondary section were developed from the respective resource documents. A single section for the entire grade range proved too lengthy.

The sections relating to art from both resource documents required major modification, since both tend to emphasize two-dimensional activities. A single section, D-2: "Arts and Crafts" for the entire grade range was prepared and craft activities together with three-dimensional art activities were emphasized. Since many schools enroll pupils with usable vision capable of engaging in two dimensional activities, many of the activities included in the two resource documents were retained.

The effective education of the visually handicapped requires formal instruction in skills not usually included in educational programs for sighted children. Two sections for these unique curricular areas were developed specifically for the Guide: D-5: "Daily Living Skills" and D-15: "Orientation and Mobility." Certain aspects of daily living skills were included in other sections of the Guide. However, a special section seemed advisable in the light of the increasing emphasis by educators on formal instruction in this area. Although orientation and mobility may be considered an aspect of daily living skills, a separate section seemed appropriate to describe the use of the special techniques developed in this field to meet the needs of the visually handicapped. This section was based on the standards delineated in THE COMSTAC REPORT and drew heavily from the instruments developed for adult training programs in orientation and mobility (NAC, 1968a). These two sections of the Guide may be viewed as experimental and use by residential schools during the next few years may dictate modifications in their content.

Section D-1: "General Curriculum Planning" was adapted with minor modifications from the two resource documents. This section together with the eighteen specific sections described above constitute the curriculum portion of the Guide. The remaining sections are related to non-curricular aspects of the school program.

Section E: "Student Activity Program," H: "Health and Safety Services," I: "School Plant," and J: "Administration and School Staff" were adapted from the resource documents with minor modifications to make them appropriate to residential schools. Relevant portions of Self-Study and Evaluation Guide (NAC, 1968a) were used in Section J: "Administration and School Staff."

In addition, for the unique aspects of a residential program included in all these sections, material from the Self Evaluation Instruments (A.A.M.D., 1966) and Standards for Services of Child Welfare Institutions (C.W.L.A., 1964) was utilized.

Section F: "Instructional Materials Services" including the library, was based on the two basic resource documents in addition to appropriate portions of the section on "Library Services" from Self-Study and Evaluation Guide (NAC, 1968a). In preparing this section, items were also included to provide schools an opportunity to describe the extent to which they utilized the resources of the regional libraries for the blind and local, state, and regional instructional materials centers for the handicapped.

The sections on guidance services in both resource documents were considered restrictive in describing the broader program needs of residential schools. Therefore, Section G: "Pupil Personnel Services" was developed to describe a range of non-instructional services: school social work, school psychology, guidance and counseling, rehabilitation counseling, and speech therapy. Since residential schools often rely heavily on state and community resources for these special services, the section included space for schools to describe such resources and the use made of them.

Section K: "Individual Staff Member Information Form" was adapted from that developed for the Self-Study and Evaluation Guide (NAC, 1968a). This form is completed by every staff member, except clerical and maintenance personnel.

A different system from that utilized by the primary resource documents was developed for summarizing the self-study. It was decided that the summary should emphasize qualitative rather than quantitative aspects. Hence, there are no numerical ratings. Each section of the Guide concludes with a summary chart of evaluation ratings included in that section. A quick inspection shows immediately where the evaluations for that section fall along the continuum of excellent to poor. Section X: "Evaluation Summary and Report" requests schools to summarize in narrative form the special strengths, improvements made recently or planned, and major long-range improvements necessary based on the summary charts of the preceding sections. Thus, the emphasis is directed toward identifying and remedying weaknesses in the program through a descriptive approach.

The coding system for both checklists and evaluations utilized by the companion guides published by the National Accreditation Council (NAC, 1968a; NAC, 1968c) was adopted for this Guide.

Review of the Guide

The first draft of the Guide prepared as outlined above was reviewed during a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services on October 17, 1967. The draft was sent to each Committee member prior to the meeting. Committee members were assigned to teams of three with specific responsibility for reviewing certain sections of the Guide intensively and reporting their reactions to the total Committee. Based on the results of this meeting, the Guide was revised and those portions requiring major modification were mailed to each member for additional comments, suggestions, and their approval.

The revised Guide was edited by staff members of the National Accreditation Council and the professional editor working with NAC on the companion guides. The final document was ready for distribution in May 1968.

Chapter III

EVALUATION OF THE GUIDE: METHOD

Selection of Schools

At the first meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services on August 10, 1967, five sets of schools, each consisting of three residential schools, were identified to represent varying sizes, geographical areas, and diversity of programs. There was no attempt to secure a random sample and each set of schools was selected for a specific quality all three possessed. The superintendent of the first school from each set was contacted by telephone to determine willingness to participate in the project. All five superintendents of the first schools contacted agreed to participate. A letter was then sent to the superintendent describing the project in greater detail.

The five schools were as follows: the Arkansas School for the Blind (Little Rock), The Maryland School for the Blind (Baltimore), the Ohio State School for the Blind (Columbus), the Oregon State School for the Blind (Salem), and the Perkins School for the Blind (Watertown, Mass.). In each school, staff members who participated in the self-study completed the instrument developed for purposes of evaluating the Guide.

Development of the Staff Reaction Form

The Staff Reaction Form was developed to solicit the reactions of staff members from each school to the Guide following the self-study. Part I was designed to gather information on the individual respondent; Part II, to obtain reaction to the total Guide with information regarding the respondent's familiarity with both the Guide and the program in the school: Part III, to solicit reactions to specific sections of the Guide. Each staff member completed Part I and Part II of the Staff Reaction Form in addition to a separate Part III for each section he helped to prepare during the self-study. A copy of the Staff Reaction Form may be found in the Appendix C.

Procedure

During May 1968, each school participating in the project was sent a copy of the Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools (NAC, 1968b) with an accompanying letter concerning the visit of the project director and a staff consultant to the school during September and October. The administrator of the school was encouraged to select a steering committee prior to that time in accordance with the suggestions given in Section A: "Manual of Procedures" of the Guide. The letter further suggested a tentative schedule for the one day visit. During the summer, sufficient copies of the total Guide and the individual sections needed to complete the self-study were sent to each school, so that staff members could become familiar with the materials.

The one-day visit to each school followed this general format:

1. An opening session of approximately one hour with the superintendent and any administrative staff he selected in order to answer general questions, to determine major concerns about both the self-study and the project, and to assess the stage each school had reached in the self-study process. The Staff Reaction Form and procedures for collecting the forms following the self-study were also discussed. Emphasis was placed on selecting a procedure with appropriate safeguards for preserving the confidentiality of the individual staff member's responses to this instrument.
2. A brief tour of the school, if time permitted.
3. Lunch with members of the steering committee to answer questions and discuss procedures.
4. Sessions with staff members to discuss the purposes of the self-study, the various aspects of the accreditation process, and the purposes of the research project, including instructions for completion of the Staff Reaction Form. In most schools, this afternoon session was conducted twice so that all staff members, including houseparents, might participate.
5. A final meeting with the superintendent and members of the steering committee to clarify any remaining issues.

At each school, the chairman of the steering committee and the superintendent were encouraged to contact the project director should any problems arise during the ensuing months while the self-study was under way.

During the last week in November, the chairman of the steering committee in each school was requested to complete a progress report form. A copy of this form may be found in Appendix D. The purpose of this form was to determine how schools were progressing with the self-study and whether modifications in the time schedule would be necessary if the self-study were taking longer than was anticipated. Data from the form showed that all schools were on schedule with the self-study.

Staff Reaction Forms were returned to the project director during March and April 1969. Data from the forms were analyzed and a draft of the final report was prepared. This draft was sent to members of the Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services during the first week in May. A meeting of the Committee was held on May 21, 1969 for purposes of reviewing data from the Staff Reaction Forms, deciding on content to be included in the addenda to the Guide, and reviewing the draft of this final report.

Chapter IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Frequency counts and the computation of per cent of frequencies were selected as the most appropriate statistical procedures for reporting data in this study. For certain tables, the range of frequencies was also included. Data from all five schools were combined in order to preserve the confidentiality of the respondents.

Table I summarizes data concerning the rate of return for completed Staff Reaction Forms from the five schools. The total number of staff members involved in the self-study may be over-estimated. The total was obtained from the number of Staff Reaction Forms ordered by each school and may have been in excess of their actual need. The percentage rate of return may, therefore, be higher than the 85.4 per cent shown in the table.

TABLE I

PER CENT RETURN OF STAFF REACTION FORMS

	No.	Per Cent
Returned	275	85.4
Left during self-study	5	1.6
Not returned	42	13.0
Total	322	100.0

Data obtained from the Staff Reaction Form are summarized in three sections, corresponding to the three parts of the instrument.

Description of the Respondents

Part I of the Staff Reaction Form was designed to obtain background information on the respondents.

Table 2 summarizes the number and percentage of respondents by role (item "c") and the range reported for each role from the five schools. All five schools included non-professional staff and three schools involved parents and/or board members in the self-study.

TABLE 2

ROLE OF RESPONDENTS

	No.	Per Cent	Range
Admin. and Supervisors	9	3.3	0-3
Teachers	187	68.0	14-66
Other prof. Staff	27	9.8	2-10
Houseparents	33	12.0	5-8
Clerical, Maintenance, etc.	13	4.7	0-6
Parents, Board Members	5	1.8	0-3
Not reported	1	0.4	
Total	275	100.0	

The highest level of formal education of the respondents (item "e") is presented in Table 3. More than three-quarters of the respondents completed four or more years of college. The relatively high percentage of professional staff as shown in Table 2 would account for this correspondingly high level of educational attainment.

TABLE 3

FORMAL EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

Level	No.	Per Cent	Range
Eighth Grade	4	1.4	0-2
High School	33	12.0	2-10
Two years college	27	9.8	1-11
Bachelors degree	105	38.2	12-28
Masters degree	92	33.5	5-34
Other degree	11	4.0	0-6
Not reported	3	1.1	0-1
Total	275	100.0	

Teaching staff members were asked about the type of certification they held. (Item "f") Table 4 presents these data. The per cent reported in the table is based on the total 187 teacher respondents; 59 or 31.5 per cent reported holding two or more types of certification. It is of interest to note that a relatively high percentage of the teaching staff apparently hold no formal certification for their role.

TABLE 4

CERTIFICATION OF TEACHER RESPONDENTS

Type of Certification	No.	Per Cent of Total
AEVH Certification	40	21.4
State Certification for Visually Handicapped	75	40.1
Regular Certificate	78	41.7
Other Certificate	29	15.5
No Certificate	45	24.1

Table 5 summarizes the total number of years of experience of the respondents and the number of years of experience in their particular school. (Items "g" and "h") During the one-day orientation visit, several administrators expressed their intention to include first year staff members as observers rather than active participants in the self-study. This may account for the small number of respondents reporting one year and less of experience. Data in this table show an interesting but unexplained gap in the 15-19 year category for both types of experience.

TABLE 5

EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

Years	Total Years		Years in this School	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
20 or more	75	27.3	41	14.9
15-19	22	8.0	18	6.5
10-14	45	16.4	41	14.9
5-9	61	22.2	69	25.1
2-4	55	20.0	79	28.7
1	7	2.5	14	5.1
Less than 1	4	1.4	5	1.9
Not reported	6	2.2	8	2.9
Totals	275	100.0	275	100.0

Since the respondents included only those who participated in the self-study, data presented in this section are descriptive of this group only and may not be representative of the total staff of the five schools. However, the relatively high level of educational attainment and the years of experience of the respondents lend support to the statement that they were qualified for evaluating the Guide.

Evaluation of the Total Guide

Part II of the Staff Reaction Form was designed to obtain general reactions to the total Guide and its use in the schools. The number of responses for any one item varies because there were many items omitted by individual respondents.

The first two items, "a" and "b", pertained to the value of the self-study itself. Respondents were asked to rate their knowledge of the total program of their school before and after the self-study on a five-point scale: (1) "very familiar with all aspects," (2) "quite familiar with most aspects," (3) "generally familiar with most aspects," (4) "somewhat familiar with most aspects of total program; very familiar with my department, division or section," (5) "familiar with my own department, division or section." Table 6 presents data from the before and after items. For each cell, data are recorded as percentages with frequencies given in parentheses.

TABLE 6

KNOWLEDGE OF TOTAL PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL
BEFORE AND AFTER THE SELF-STUDY
N = 261

AFTER	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
A (1)		1.1 (3)	2.3 (6)	5.0 (13)	3.4 (9)
F (2)	0.8 (2)	8.4 (22)	11.1 (29)	13.4 (35)	
T (3)	1.9 (5)	11.9 (31)	10.0 (26)		
E (4)	4.6 (12)	19.2 (50)	1.1 (3)		
R (5)	5.8 (15)				

BEFORE

Table 6 shows that approximately half the respondents (47.1 per cent) said they knew more about their school as a result of the self-study; three or 1.1 per cent said they knew less. It is possible that these three persons realized after the self-study that their knowledge about their school was superficial before and hence rated their knowledge lower after the self-study; it is also possible that they circled the wrong numbers.

Of the 34 respondents who said they knew the least about their school before the self-study, 44 per cent remained in the same category and 56 per cent moved up one or more categories. It is also of interest to note that 38 or 14.5 per cent of the respondents moved two or more categories up in their knowledge of their school after the self-study.

It was assumed that the length of service in the school would be related to the knowledge of the total program before the self-study. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient between years worked in the school (Part I, item "g") and knowledge of total program before the self-study (Part II, item "a") was computed using the Olivetti Programma 101 (Hays, 1966, p.497). The coefficient of correlation obtained was .62 which shows a fairly strong relationship between these two variables.

Item "c" asked respondents to rate their familiarity with the Guide from (1) "not familiar" to (4) "very familiar." Table 7 summarizes data from this item. The table presents frequencies, per cent of frequencies for the total responding, and the range of frequencies among the five schools.

TABLE 7

FAMILIARITY OF RESPONDENTS WITH THE TOTAL GUIDE

Rating	No.	Per Cent	Frequency Range
(1) Not familiar at all	27	10.1	3-9
(2) Vaguely familiar	143	53.4	12-46
(3) Generally familiar	69	25.7	2-31
(4) Very familiar	29	10.8	2-20
Total	268	100.0	

Table 8 summarizes data concerning the usefulness and the accuracy of the Guide in describing the school's program, (Items "d" and "e") Respondents circled (1) to express general satisfaction and (2) to indicate that certain aspects were omitted. Respondents selecting (2) were requested to list these aspects specifically. Approximately half the respondents circling (2) either failed to add suggestions or made comments that were not relevant to the item. There was considerable overlap among the suggestions and frequently the same comment was recorded for both items. The most frequently mentioned were related to the need for a section on programs for the multi-handicapped and a separate section for houseparents.

TABLE 8

USEFULNESS AND ACCURACY OF THE GUIDE IN DESCRIBING A SCHOOL'S PROGRAM

	Usefulness		Accuracy	
Responses	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
(1)	130	47.3	115	41.8
(2)	87	31.6	92	33.5
No response	58	21.1	68	24.7
Totals	275	100.0	275	100.0

Table 9 summarizes data from items "f", "g", and "h", all of which relate to the mechanics or format of the Guide, namely, the clarity of the instructions and coding for Checklists and Evaluations. Respondents used (1) to express general satisfaction and (2) to recommend certain revisions. Those selecting (2) were asked to specify. As with the foregoing items, comments tended to be omitted, repetitious, or not related to the content of the item. Data presented in this table support a general feeling of satisfaction with these aspects of the Guide.

TABLE 9

EVALUATION OF MECHANICS OF THE GUIDE

Responses	Clarity of Instructions		Coding: Checklists		Coding: Evaluations	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
(1)	204	74.2	206	74.9	201	73.1
(2)	36	13.1	41	14.9	32	11.6
No response	35	12.7	28	10.2	42	15.3
Totals	275	100.0	275	100.0	275	100.0

Items "i" and "j" were open-ended to give respondents an opportunity to express any further thoughts they may have regarding the Guide. The content of these comments was useful in preparing the addenda to the Guide which is described in the following chapter.

Data presented and discussed in this section tend to support a feeling of general satisfaction with the content and format of the Guide. The two most frequently mentioned criticisms related to the inadequacy of the Guide for describing the function of houseparents in the residential school and for describing programs for multi-handicapped children. Recommendations regarding these issues are discussed in the following chapter.

Evaluation of Specific Sections of the Guide

Respondents completed a separate Part III for each section of the Guide with which they worked. It is not possible to determine whether all members on the sub-committee completed Part III or whether some completed the part without serving on the committee. A comparison of the number of staff involved in completing each section as reported on the Progress Report (Appendix D) and the numbers of Part III received for that section showed that for each section three-fourths or more were returned. As mentioned above, certain groups, such as new staff members, houseparents, and non-professional personnel may have served on subcommittees and were listed on the Progress Report, but were not expected to complete the Staff Reaction Form because of their limited involvement in the self-study itself and/or their lack of familiarity with the school program. The number of respondent evaluations per section ranged from 7 to 50.

Data from three items for each section are reported below: "a"which related to the Guiding Principles for each section; "b" concerning Checklist items and "e" concerning Evaluations. Responses to the remaining items were recorded in the appropriate section of a master copy of the Guide and will be considered when the next edition of the Guide is prepared. For the most part, the respondents suggested editorial changes and no one item was mentioned by more than ten respondents. This relatively low frequency of comments lends further support to the general feeling of satisfaction with the Guide.

Part III was not intended for the following sections of the Guide: A: "Manual of Procedures;" B: "Philosophy and Objectives;" C: "School and Community Profile;" K: "Individual Staff Member Information Form;" and X: "Evaluation Summary and Report." A small number of respondents did complete the form for these sections but these yielded no meaningful data. Comments concerning these sections included in Part II were in general very favorable.

Tables 10 and 11 present data concerning the usefulness of the Guiding Principles as background material for the curricular (D)sections and non-curricular (E-J) sections. Respondents used a five point scale: (1) "extremely useful," (2) "very useful," (3) "useful," (4)"somewhat useful," (5)not useful." The tables report the number of respondents per section and the per cent for each rating category.

These tables show that in general respondents found the Guiding Principles useful for presenting background information. There were, however, two exceptions. Almost one-third found D-3: "Business Education" and D-19: "Vocational Trade and Industrial Education" least useful. These two sections probably represent curricular areas where the greatest variation of course content and conduct would be present both among residential schools and between residential and community schools. The Guide drew heavily on material which is appropriate for community schools and/or larger residential schools. Respondents from the larger schools included in this study did find the Guiding Principles for these two sections more useful than did those from the smaller schools.

TABLE 10

EVALUATION OF "GUIDING PRINCIPLES":
CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Respondents Section:	No.	NR	Categories by Per cent 1	2	3	4	5
D1	26	3.9	11.5	53.8	26.9	3.9	0.0
D2	17	5.9	0.0	23.5	70.6	0.0	0.0
D3	13	0.0	7.7	38.4	23.1	15.4	15.4
D4	7	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	14.3	0.0
D5	31	0.0	12.9	51.6	25.8	9.7	0.0
D6	8	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
D7	40	0.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	0.0
D8	16	0.0	0.0	56.3	31.3	6.2	6.2
D9	11	0.0	18.2	54.5	18.2	9.1	0.0
D10	13	7.7	7.7	38.5	38.4	7.7	0.0
D11	13	15.4	0.0	46.1	30.8	7.7	0.0
D12	14	0.0	0.0	71.4	21.4	7.2	0.0
D13	50	2.0	6.0	38.0	46.0	8.0	0.0
D14	25	0.0	12.0	28.0	48.0	8.0	4.0
D15	15	0.0	13.3	26.7	60.0	0.0	0.0
D16	18	0.0	0.0	38.9	44.4	5.6	11.1
D17	28	0.0	17.9	42.9	32.1	7.1	0.0
D18	46	0.0	6.5	43.5	36.9	10.9	2.2
D19	15	0.0	0.0	46.6	26.7	26.7	0.0

TABLE 11

EVALUATION OF "GUIDING PRINCIPLES":
NON-CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Respondents Section:	No.	NR	Categories by Per cent 1	2	3	4	5
E	39	0.0	7.7	43.6	41.0	7.7	0.0
F	16	0.0	12.5	37.5	37.5	6.25	6.25
G	24	0.0	8.3	50.0	29.2	12.5	0.0
H	22	4.5	18.2	54.6	18.2	0.0	4.5
I	16	0.0	43.8	37.5	12.5	6.2	0.0
J	14	7.1	14.3	35.7	28.6	14.3	0.0

Data regarding the appropriateness of the Checklist items for describing the school programs are presented in Table 12 for the curricular sections and Table 13 for the non-curricular sections. Respondents used the same five point scale described above.

Data presented in these tables show that the same two sections for which the Guiding Principles were least useful also have Checklist items which are not useful.

Checklist items from D-4: "Core Program" also seemed inappropriate. This section was included in the Guide for reasons delineated in Chapter II. The project director drew heavily on Evaluative Criteria in developing this section and, in its present format, it may not be appropriate for either regular secondary schools or residential schools. It has not been used extensively by the former and this may be due to its inappropriate content. The definition of a "core program" varies greatly among schools and it is possible that utilizing a more descriptive approach may meet the needs of the residential school more effectively in describing its own version of a "core program".

Two other sections were rated low by one-fourth or more respondents: D-9: "Foreign Languages" and F: "Instructional Materials Services." However, since one-half or more of the respondents rated these sections in the top two categories, the variation may possibly be attributed to factors other than dissatisfaction with the Checklist items. Such variables as size of school, character of program, geographical location, etc. may be operative to make these sections appropriate to some but not all schools.

TABLE 12

EVALUATION OF "CHECKLIST":
CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Section	Respondents No.	Categories by Per Cent NR	1	2	3	4	5
D1	26	3.9	7.7	61.5	19.2	7.7	0.0
D2	17	0.0	0.0	35.3	52.9	11.8	0.0
D3	13	0.0	0.0	23.1	53.8	15.4	7.7
D4	7	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.85	42.85	0.0
D5	31	0.0	12.9	41.9	35.5	9.7	0.0
D6	8	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	12.5
D7	40	0.0	5.0	52.5	27.5	15.0	0.0
D8	16	0.0	12.5	68.75	18.75	0.0	0.0
D9	11	0.0	0.0	54.5	18.2	27.3	0.0
D10	13	7.7	7.7	30.8	53.8	0.0	0.0
D11	13	7.7	0.0	69.2	15.4	0.0	7.7
D12	14	0.0	0.0	71.4	21.4	7.2	0.0
D13	50	2.0	4.0	38.0	40.0	16.0	0.0
D14	25	0.0	16.0	24.0	56.0	4.0	0.0
D15	15	0.0	13.3	46.7	40.0	0.0	0.0
D16	18	0.0	0.0	55.5	27.8	16.7	0.0
D17	28	0.0	7.1	67.9	17.8	3.6	3.6
D18	46	2.2	2.2	45.7	30.4	15.2	4.3
D19	15	0.0	0.0	13.3	53.4	33.3	0.0

Data regarding the usefulness of the Evaluations (Item "e") are presented in Table 14 for the curricular sections and Table 15 for the non-curricular sections. The same rating scale was used by respondents.

Evaluations appeared less useful for D-4: "Core Program" and D-19: "Vocational Trade and Industrial Education," which is consistent with data in Tables 10 and 12.

TABLE 13

EVALUATION OF "CHECKLIST":
NON-CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Section:	Respondents No.	NR	Categories by Per Cent 1	2	3	4	5
E	39	0.0	5.1	35.9	41.0	18.0	0.0
F	16	6.25	18.75	37.5	12.5	25.0	0.0
G	24	0.0	12.5	54.2	29.2	4.1	0.0
H	22	4.6	13.6	54.5	22.7	0.0	4.6
I	16	0.0	18.75	62.5	12.5	0.0	6.25
J	14	14.3	7.14	50.0	21.42	7.14	0.0

It is interesting to note, however, that for D-3: "Business Education" Evaluations were more useful than either the Guiding Principles or the Checklists.

TABLE 14

EVALUATION OF "EVALUATIONS":
CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Section:	Respondents No.	NR	Categories by Per Cent 1	2	3	4	5
D1	26	11.5	0.0	65.4	23.1	0.0	0.0
D2	17	5.9	5.9	29.4	41.2	17.6	0.0
D3	13	0.0	0.0	46.1	38.5	7.7	7.7
D4	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.4	28.6	0.0
D5	31	3.2	9.7	57.6	32.3	3.2	0.0
D6	8	50.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5
D7	40	5.0	7.5	42.5	27.5	15.0	2.5
D8	16	0.0	6.25	75.0	12.5	6.25	0.0
D9	11	0.0	9.1	36.4	45.4	9.1	0.0
D10	13	0.0	7.7	38.5	53.8	0.0	0.0
D11	13	15.4	0.0	53.8	23.1	0.0	7.7
D12	14	0.0	14.3	35.7	35.7	14.3	0.0
D13	50	4.0	4.0	44.0	36.0	12.0	0.0
D14	25	8.0	8.0	32.0	40.0	8.0	4.0
D15	15	0.0	13.3	26.7	60.0	0.0	0.0
D16	18	11.1	0.0	55.5	16.7	16.7	0.0
D17	28	0.0	7.1	64.3	17.9	10.7	0.0
D18	46	4.3	2.2	47.9	34.8	6.5	4.3
D19	15	0.0	0.0	13.4	53.3	33.3	0.0

TABLE 15

EVALUATION OF "EVALUATIONS":
NON-CURRICULAR SECTIONS

Sections:	Respondents No.	NR	Categories by Per Cent 1	2	3	4	5
E	39	0.0	2.6	46.2	33.3	17.9	0.0
F	16	0.0	18.75	25.0	37.5	18.75	0.0
G	24	4.2	12.5	41.7	33.3	8.3	0.0
H	22	9.1	9.1	63.6	13.6	0.0	4.6
I	16	0.0	25.0	50.0	18.75	0.0	6.25
J	14	7.1	0.0	57.2	28.6	7.1	0.0

One school submitted a set of Staff Reaction Forms Parts II and III prepared by the steering committee. These data are not included in the tables presented in this chapter, but all comments and suggestions for revision of items were recorded in the master copy of the Guide to be used in preparing the next edition.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Data presented in Chapter IV do show that in general the respondents found the Guide appropriate and useful for describing the program of their respective schools. The two major deficiencies in the content of the Guide were related to the need for a mechanism to describe programs for the multi-handicapped and to describe more fully the role of houseparents in the school program. Recommendations concerning these are discussed below. Other reactions to the Guide fell into two categories: specific suggestions for editorial and/or content changes and comments which showed that certain schools encountered difficulties in adapting the context of the Guide to their individual school. Recommendations concerning the latter are discussed below. With regard to the former, the suggestions will be utilized when a new edition of the Guide is prepared.

The most frequently mentioned deficiency identified by respondents in their comments about the Guide related to the need for a separate section to describe effectively classes and/or programs for pupils with multiple impairments. The great diversity of such programs complicates the development of a single section which would be appropriate to meet the unique requirements of each individual school. The solution lay in devising a section which would provide an outline for describing the program or course offering and providing guidelines for evaluating it.

A new section, D-20: "Other Course or Program," was developed to meet this need. A copy of this section may be found in Appendix E. The format for this section was adapted from Cawelti (1968). It was reviewed in draft form by superintendents of five residential schools and their suggestions are reflected in its final form. This section may be used to describe any course or program for which there is no appropriate section in the current edition of the Guide. The experience of schools during the next few years in using this less structured section may also point toward the feasibility of adopting this format for the next edition of the Guide.

Respondents from two schools expressed concern that the Guide did not provide sufficient opportunity to describe effectively the residential aspects of their school's program. A separate section for houseparents was not developed for the present edition of the Guide because the Advisory Committee on the Accreditation of Educational Services supported the point of view that the family aspect of the residential school should be an integral part of the total program. Therefore, residential aspects are included among the several sections of the Guide and it is recommended that houseparents should be included as members of subcommittees preparing the reports for these sections. In order to clarify the intent of the Guide, the role of the houseparents in the self-study was described more fully in a section of the supplement to Section A. This supplement may be found in Appendix F.

The supplement also includes instructions for individualizing the Guide to meet the needs of a particular school. The content was developed from suggestions and concerns expressed by some of the respondents. This supplement, together with the new section, D-20: "Other Course or Program," constitute the addenda to the Guide and will be sent to schools undertaking a self-study in the future.

The application of any materials and/or practices in general education to the education of the handicapped usually faces certain difficulties. What is appropriate for the "normal" is not always appropriate to the handicapped. Accreditation and the instruments and process of a self-study are familiar to most secondary school personnel. Further, the benefits of the self-study and the merits of accreditation are well known and accepted in general secondary education.

Staff members in most residential schools for the visually handicapped, however, are unfamiliar with both the self-study and accreditation processes because these represent a new addition to the field. It was appropriate therefore, that this project be undertaken to determine the feasibility of utilizing for a residential school program for the visually handicapped a self-study instrument adapted from currently used instruments in general education. This study demonstrated that this could be done successfully.

The objective data presented in Chapter IV support the generally favorable reactions to the Guide from residential school personnel. The data gathered from the instrument used in the study, however, included many subjective evaluations that could not be quantified and reported in the tables of this report. The master copy of the Guide incorporates these numerous comments and suggestions regarding specific sections, sub-sections, and individual items. This master copy attests to the interest and enthusiasm of the respondents for assisting in making the next edition of the Guide even better and more appropriate to their needs.

The completion of this project, however, can be considered as only one step in the process of evaluating the Guide. In addition, reactions to the Guide by the professionals who participated as members of on-site review teams to the five schools have been obtained. Also the self-studies submitted by the schools to the National Accreditation Council are reviewed intensively. Careful attention to all these aspects should insure the production of a more effective and appropriate instrument in the next edition.

REFERENCES

American Association on Mental Deficiency. Self Evaluation Instruments. (Mimeo.) Columbus, Ohio: 1601 West Broad Street., 1966.

American Association on Mental Deficiency. Standards for State Residential Institutions for the Mentally Retarded. Monograph Supplement to American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Vol. 68 (January 1964).

Cawelti, Gordon. High School Evaluation Guide. Chicago: North Central Association, 5454 South Central Drive, 1968.

Child Welfare League of America. Standards for Services of Child Welfare Institutions. New York: Child Welfare League of America, Inc. 44 E. 23rd St., 1964.

Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind. THE COMSTAC REPORT: Standards for Strengthened Services . New York: National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, 1966.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.

National Accreditation Council. Self-Study and Evaluation Guide. New York: National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, 1968. (a)

National Accreditation Council. Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools. New York: National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, 1968. (b)

National Accreditation Council. Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Sheltered Workshops. New York: National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, 1968. (c)

National Catholic Education Association. Criteria for Evaluation of Catholic Elementary Schools. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, Inc., 1965.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative Criteria. 1960 Edition. Washington, D. C. : N. S. S. S. E., 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Instructors of the Blind. Some Proposed Minimum Requirements for Schools for the Blind, Washington, D. C.: A. A. I. B., 1958. Volume II. 1960.

Ashcroft, S. C. "Blind and Partially Seeing Children." In Exceptional Children in Schools (L. M. Dunn, ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Board of Education of the City of New York. Instructing Visually Limited Boys and Girls. Brooklyn, N. Y.: 110 Livingston St., 1957.

Boston University School of Education. Elementary Evaluative Criteria. Boston, Mass. 02215.

Friedensohn, Oscar. "A Symposium on Accreditation," The New Outlook for the Blind, 61, 313-322, 1967.

Graham, R. Upgrading Educational Facilities for Children Who Are Partially Seeing. New York: National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, 1956.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Standards for the Approval of School Districts: Guide for the Self-Evaluation of a School System. Des Moines, Iowa: State Department of Public Instruction, 1961.

Mackie, Romaine P. and Cohoe, Edith. Teachers of Children Who Are Partially Seeing. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

_____ and Dunn, L. M. State Certification Requirements for Teachers of Exceptional Children. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

_____ Teachers of Children Who Are Blind. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1958.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. How to Conduct an Institutional Self-Evaluation. Philadelphia, Penn.: 101 North 33 St., 1963.

_____ Middle States Membership and Accreditation. Philadelphia, Penn.: 101 North 33 St., 1933.

_____ Questionnaire Guide for Institutional Self-Evaluation, Parts "A and B". Philadelphia, Penn.: 101 North 33 St., 1958.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. National Professional Accrediting Agencies -- An Overview of Policies and Practices in Twenty-Three Fields. Washington, D. C.: 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W., 1963.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Standards and Guide for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: Mills Building, 1960.

National Education Association. Profiles of Excellence. Washington, D. C.: 1201 Sixteenth St. N.W., 1966.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools. Guide for Self-Evaluation and Accreditation of Higher Schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Revised 1957.

Scholl, Geraldine T. "Accreditation: What It Can Mean for Residential Schools". The New Outlook for the Blind, 63, 50-54, 1969.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. General Accreditation in Higher Education. Atlanta, Georgia: 795 Peachtree St. N.E., 1963.

_____. Manual for the Institutional Self-Study and Periodic Visitation Program. Atlanta, Georgia: 795 Peachtree St. N.E., 1963.

_____. Committee on Elementary Education. A Guide to the Evaluation and Accreditation of Elementary Schools. Atlanta, Georgia: 795 Peachtree St. N.E., 1964.

State of California, Department of Education. Evaluating the Elementary School. Sacramento, Cal.: Bureau of Textbooks and Publications, 1961.

_____. Evaluating Pupil Progress. Sacramento, Cal.: Bureau of Textbooks and Publications, 1960.

State of New Jersey Department of Education. Guidelines for Approval Through Self-Study for New Jersey Secondary Schools. Trenton, N.J.: 225 West State St., 1960.

State of Ohio, Department of Public Instruction. A Guide for Self-Appraisal of the Elementary School. Columbus: State Office Building, 1961.

State University of New York. Minimum Requirements for Schools. Albany, N.Y.: 8 Thurlow Terrace, 1964.

Texas State Department of Education. Handbook for Self-Appraisal and Improvement of Elementary Schools. Austin, Texas: State Department of Education, 1948.

Appendix A

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Chairman:
Dr. Jack W. Birch
Associate Dean
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Donald Blasch
Director
Blind Rehabilitation Programs
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Dr. Ablett Flury
Trenton, N. J.

Mr. William H. English
Principal
Department for the Blind
The Virginia School for the Deaf
and Blind
Staunton, Va.

Dr. Joseph J. Parnicky
Superintendent
Edward R. Johnstone
Training and Research Center
Bordentown, N. J.

Miss Margaret Esch
Principal
Western Pennsylvania School for
Blind Children
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Leland C. Sanborn
Superintendent
New York State School for the Blind
Batavia, N. Y.

. . . . . .

Project Director:
Dr. Geraldine T. Scholl
Professor
School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Project Coordinator:
Mr. Charles I. Sheldon
Assistant Executive Director
National Accreditation Council
for Agencies Serving the Blind
and Visually Handicapped
New York, N. Y.

Special Consultant:
Dr. William T. Bean
Associate Executive Secretary
Commission on Secondary Schools
Middle States Association of Colleges
and Secondary Schools
Philadelphia, Pa.

Appendix B

SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION GUIDE
FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A	Manual of Procedures	1
B	Philosophy and Objectives	17
C	School and Community Profile	23
D-1	General Curriculum Planning	53
D-2	Arts and Crafts	75
D-3	Business Education (Secondary)	91
D-4	Core Program	107
D-5	Daily Living Skills	121
D-6	Distributive Education (Secondary)	135
D-7	English Language Arts (Elementary)	147
D-8	English Language Arts (Secondary)	165
D-9	Foreign Languages	183
D-10	Health Education	199
D-11	Home Economics (Secondary)	213
D-12	Industrial Arts (Secondary)	227
D-13	Mathematics	245
D-14	Music	263
D-15	Orientation and Mobility	279
D-16	Physical Education	293
D-17	Science	307
D-18	Social Studies	323
D-19	Vocational Trade and Industrial Education (Secondary)	339
E	Student Activity Program	355
F	Instructional Materials Services	373
G	Pupil Personnel Services	395
H	Health and Safety Services	419
I	School Plant	435
J	Administration and School Staff	459
K	Individual Staff Member Information Form	505
X	Evaluation Summary and Report	509

Appendix C

RESPONDENT NO. _____

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION COUNCIL
for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, Inc.
84 Fifth Avenue – Suite 501, New York, N. Y. 10011

Self--Study and Evaluation

Guide for Residential Schools

STAFF REACTION FORM

The purpose of this form is to obtain information regarding your impressions and reactions to the *Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools* as it is used by your school in its self-study. This is part of an evaluation of the *Guide* being undertaken in cooperation with five outstanding residential schools located in various parts of the country. We are asking you, as a participant in the self-study of your school, for your constructive comments, to assist us in making more effective use of this instrument and in revising future editions of the *Guide.*

There are three parts to this Staff Reaction Form. You should complete one copy of Parts I and II and, in addition, complete one separate Part III for *each* individual section of the *Guide* you helped to prepare during the self-study process. *Please be sure to answer every item.*

Please do not sign your name. No attempt will be made to identify any of the respondents or schools, nor will individual responses be available to anyone except the staff of the National Accreditation Council and its consultants involved in the evaluation of this *Guide.* The number in the upper right-hand corner of this form is designed to preserve the anonymity of your response and to assist the Project Director in determining whether forms have been returned by all staff members who have taken part in the self-study. The Chairman of your school's Steering Committee will record the number of the form given to you, but will not see the form after you have completed it. Our Project Director will not have the names of participants assigned a given number.

Upon completion of the self-study of your school, please mail this form in the envelope provided, directly to the Project Director. Your participation in this evaluation project is sincerely appreciated and, we hope, will be an important part of a significant contribution to this field.

Part I

General Information

Instructions: For each item, please circle the number of the statement which applies to you. Where requested, write information in the space provided.

a. School _____

b. Date form completed _____

c. Your title _____

d. Your sex:

(1) Female
(2) Male

e. Your formal education: (Circle highest level completed.)

(1) Eighth grade.
(2) High school.
(3) Two-year college.
(4) Baccalaureate degree.
(5) Master's degree.
(6) Ph.D. or Ed.D.
(7) Other (specify) _____

f. *For teaching staff only.* Your teaching certificate: (Circle all that apply.)

(1) AAIB certification.
(2) State certification or approval to teach visually handicapped.
(3) Regular teaching certificate; not to teach visually handicapped.
(4) No certificate.
(5) Other (specify) _____

g. Years worked in this school: (Count one-half year or more as one full year.)

(1) Less than one year.
(2) One year.
(3) Two to four years.
(4) Five to nine years.
(5) Ten to fourteen years.
(6) Fifteen to nineteen years.
(7) Twenty years or more.

h. Total number of years worked in your profession or occupation:

(1) Less than one year.
(2) One year.
(3) Two to four years.
(4) Five to nine years.
(5) Ten to fourteen years.
(6) Fifteen to nineteen years.
(7) Twenty years or more.

Part II

General Reactions to the Guide

Part II is designed to solicit your general reactions to the **total Guide** *and its use by your school. For each item, circle the number of the description that* **most** *nearly applies to you. If none applies, select the alternative "Other" and describe.*

a. My knowledge of the *total program* of my school *before* the self-study:

(1) Very familiar with all aspects.
(2) Quite familiar with most aspects.
(3) Generally familiar with most aspects.
(4) Somewhat familiar with most aspects of total program; very familiar with my department (division, section).
(5) Familiar with my own department (division, section).
(6) Other (describe) _____

b. My knowledge of the *total program* of my school *after* the self-study:

(1) Very familiar with all aspects.
(2) Quite familiar with most aspects.
(3) Generally familiar with most aspects.
(4) Somewhat familiar with most aspects of total program, very familiar with my department (division, section).
(5) Familiar with my own department (division, section).
(6) Other (describe)_____

c. The degree of familiarity I have with the *total Guide:*

(1) Not familiar at all.
(2) Vaguely familiar.
(3) Generally familiar.
(4) Very familiar.
(5) Other (describe) _____

d. The *usefulness* of the content of the *total Guide* in describing my school's program as I know it:

(1) Sections are available to describe *total program* effectively.
(2) Certain aspects of the *total program* are *not included* in any section in the *Guide.* (List these aspects.)

e. The *accuracy* with which my school's program can be described by the *Guide:*

(1) All aspects of the program can be described accurately.
(2) Certain aspects could not be described accurately by any section of the *Guide:* (List these aspects.)

f. The instructions for completing the self-study in Section A – *"Manual of Procedures"* of the *Guide* were:

(1) Very clear and could be readily followed.
(2) In general clear, but I had difficulty with certain aspects. (List these.)

(3) Should be rewritten. My suggestions for improving them are as follows: (Please be as specific as possible.)

g. The coding for the *Checklists:*

(1) Included the full range of possibilities to judge our school.
(2) Should have included more possibilities. (List these.)

h. The coding for *Evaluations:*

(1) Included the full range of possibilities to judge our school.
(2) Should have included more possibilities. (List these.)

i. Other comments about my *general* reactions to *total Guide:*

j. My suggestions for improving the self-study *process* are:

RESPONDENT NO. _____

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION COUNCIL
for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, Inc.
84 Fifth Avenue -- Suite 501, New York, N. Y. 10011

STAFF REACTION FORM

Part III

Reactions to Individual Sections of the Self–Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools

Please complete a separate Part III for each section of the **Guide** *you helped to prepare. You may secure additional copies of this part of the form from the Chairman of your school's Steering Committee.*

Part III is designed to solicit your reactions to **specific** *sections of the* **Guide.** *For each item, circle the number of the description that* **most** *nearly reflects your reactions.*

Number and Title of Section _____

a. For presenting background material, the *Guiding Principles* for this section were
   (1) Extremely useful.
   (2) Very useful.
   (3) Useful for consideration.
   (4) Somewhat useful.
   (5) Not useful to me at all. (Please specify in what way.)

b. For describing the program of my school, the *Checklist* items were:
   (1) Extremely useful.
   (2) Very useful.
   (3) Useful.
   (4) Somewhat useful.
   (5) Not useful at all.

Instructions: In answering "c" and "f" below, indicate in the space provided the Roman numeral and and capital letter identifying the part of the **Section,** *and the number or lower-case letter identifying the* **Checklist** *item or* **Evaluation** *item to which you refer. Example #1:* **Checklist** *item "29" in Part III B, "General Characteristics of the Program," of Section D-1,* **General Curriculum Planning,** *(p. 64), would be shown as "III. B. 29." Example #2:* **Evaluation** *item "a" in Part IV, "General Outcomes of the Curriculum," of Section D-1, (p. 69), would be indicated as "IV. a."*

c. The *Checklist* items that were not useful and should be dropped are:
(Include comments for revision or modification for each *Checklist* item indicated)

d. My suggestions for additional *Checklist* items for this section are:

e. For evaluating our school program, the *Evaluations* were:
   (1) Extremely useful.
   (2) Very Useful.
   (3) Useful.
   (4) Somewhat useful.
   (5) Not useful at all.

f. The *Evaluations* which were not useful and should be dropped are: (Include comments for revision or modifications for each *Evaluation* question listed.)

g. My suggestions for additional *Evaluations* for this section are as follows:

h. I have the following additional comments concerning this section of the *Guide:*

Appendix D

PROGRESS REPORT FORM

National Accreditation Council

for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, Inc.

Self-Study and Evaluation Guide Research Project

Progress Report

(to be returned by December 1, 1968)

School: _____

Indicate your progress to date on each section of the Guide:

Sections	Not Used (Check)	Completed (Check)	Target Date for Completion	Number staff involved in preparing this section
B				
C				
D-1				
D-2				
D-3				
D-4				
D-5				
D-6				
D-7				
D-8				
D-9				
D-10				
D-11				
D-12				
D-13				
D-14				
D-15				
D-16				
D-17				
D-18				
D-19				
E				
F				
G				
H				
I				
J				

1. Number of total staff meetings devoted to self-study:_____

2. Total (approximate) number of sub-committee meetings held:_____

3. Number of steering committee meetings held:_____

Return to:
Geraldine T. Scholl

Appendix E

SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION GUIDE
FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS | 1969

Other Course or Program

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION COUNCIL
For Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped
84 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

NAME OF COURSE OR PROGRAM DESCRIBED HEREIN:

_____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CODING

Three steps should precede the use of this section:

1. *Section A, Manual of Procedures,* should be read in order to understand the overall framework and governing principles of the self-study and accreditation process.

2. *Section B, Philosophy and Objectives,* should be reviewed, since it embraces the statement of the school's philosophy and objectives, an indispensable base for evaluation of its performance.

3. *Section C, School and Community Profile,* also should be reviewed, since it contains basic information about the student body and the community to which the school is related.

This section is designed to convey an accurate description of the school's conditions and performance in a particular area.

Coding the Checklist. The items in the checklist describe conditions (characteristics, provisions, or qualities) found in an acceptable school. Coding each item by one of the following notations indicates whether, and to what extent, practice meets these conditions, and also establishes a factual basis for making the succeeding evaluations.

In the parentheses ( ) preceding the checklist item, insert a symbol according to the following code:

✔✔—The condition is fully met.
✔—The condition is partly met.
O—The condition, although needed and desirable, is not met, or is met to such a limited extent as to be virtually inoperative.
?—The applicability of the condition to the school is questioned.
X—The condition is clearly inapplicable to the school.

Coding the Evaluation Questions. Each evaluation question poses a criterion for judgment. Careful discrimination should be exercised in arriving at such judgment, bearing in mind that evaluations are not aimed at perfection but are keyed to realistic, attainable levels of performance. While the ratings embrace such concepts as *excellent, well, satisfactory, poor,* etc., which cannot be specifically defined, a valid judgment can be formulated if the evaluator balances a) the requirements postulated by the checklist items, b) the school's stated philosophy and objectives and its community relationships, and c) the practical knowledge derived from the evaluator's own professional experience.

In the brackets [ ] preceding the evaluation question, insert the code letter that best describes the school's performance:

E—Excellent. The school meets the criterion to the *fullest* extent and functions *excellently* in regard to it.
VG—Very Good. The school meets the criterion to the *fullest* extent and functions *well* in regard to it; or it meets the criterion to a *satisfactory* extent (i.e., not full coverage) and functions *excellently* in regard to it.
G—Good. The school meets the criterion to a *satisfactory* extent and functions *well* in regard to it.
F—Fair. The school meets the criterion to a *satisfactory* extent (i.e., not full coverage), but functions *poorly* in regard to it; or it meets the criterion to a *limited* extent but functions *satisfactorily* in regard to it.
P—Poor. The school meets the criterion only to a *limited* extent and functions *poorly* in regard to it; or it makes *no provision* for meeting a needed criterion.
M—Missing. The element identified in the question is missing, but the school's need for it is open to question.
NA—Not Applicable. The element identified in the question does not apply to the school.

Comments. Just as not all of the checklist items necessarily apply to all schools, not all of every school's activities are necessarily covered by the items in the checklist. The space provided under *Comments* should be used to note any important feature or characteristic of the school's activity relating to the subject but not included in the checklist. Such notations may be supplemented, if necessary, by supporting data attached to the end of the section, or by cross-references to other sections. Addenda and cross-references should be accurately identified by notation of the section, part, and item number to which they pertain. (For example, material attached to the end of a section might be marked "Supporting Data. Section D-4, Part IV, Checklist Item 4"; a cross-reference might be noted as "See Section H, Part III-A, Evaluation a.")

This material was prepared as a result of a study supported by a grant provided by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Project No. 8-8023.

D-20

OTHER COURSE OR PROGRAM

Instructions

Schools having a program or offering a course which does not fit one of the curriculum areas included among the "D-Sections" may use this section as a guide for presenting information about the course or program. This section may be utilized for a single course, such as sociology offered at the secondary level, or for a total program, such as special classes for the mentally retarded or a program for deaf-blind; or to describe more fully the residential part of the school's program.

A separate D-20 Section should be used to describe each separate course or program not covered by other sections of the Guide.

The self-study subcommittee preparing this section should gather information relating to the questions asked below which are appropriate to the course or program. This information should be summarized briefly in narrative form under each heading and appended to this form. Statements, sample documents, graphs and charts, and any other kinds of data may be appended to the document.

I. OBJECTIVES

DESCRIPTION (Select only those questions which are appropriate to describe the course or program. Use separate sheets to prepare your narrative answers and attach to this section.)

1. State the name of the course or program described by this section.

2. What are the objectives or desired outcomes of this course (program)?

3. Are they clearly written?

4. Are they sufficiently comprehensive to establish all the major desired outcomes of the course (program)?

. . . . .

From the following CHECKLIST and EVALUATION, complete on this page only those which are appropriate to the course (program) that you are evaluating.

CHECKLIST

( ) 1. Up-to-date desired outcomes or objectives have been established in writing for this course (program).

( ) 2. These desired outcomes are sufficiently comprehensive; they seek to effect change in significant kinds of student behavior.

EVALUATION

[ ] a. How clearly are the desired outcomes or objectives of this course (program) defined?

COMMENTS

II. PUPIL INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION (Describe if different from students described in Section C, "School and Community Profile." Select only those questions which are appropriate to describe the course or program. Use separate sheets to prepare your narrative answers and attach to this section.)

1. What is the academic aptitude or ability of students enrolled in this course (program)?

2. What criteria are used to select students for this course (program)?

3. What do achievement records or follow-up data show about the students previously enrolled in this course (program)?

. . . . .

From the following CHECKLIST and EVALUATION, complete on this page only those which are appropriate to the course or (program).

CHECKLIST

( ) 1. Appropriate criteria in writing are established for: (check)
____ selection of students for the course (program).

____ admission of students to the course (program).

____ dismissal of students from the course (program).

( ) 2. Follow-up data are available on students formerly enrolled in this course (program).

EVALUATION

[ ] 1. To what extent have criteria been established for students enrolled in this course (program)?

COMMENTS

III. PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION (Select only those questions which are appropriate to describe the course or program. Use separate sheets to prepare your narrative answers and attach to this section.)

1. What sequence of experience is provided to accomplish the stated outcomes?

2. What instructional materials and equipment are used? Are these materials relevant to the aims and to the most recent recommendations of authorities in this field? Are the resources of the school and community adequate to support this course (program)? How are such resources utilized?

3. What instructional procedures are employed for students in this course (program)?

4. What organizational structure or provision is made to assure a continuous appraisal and curriculum improvement program? What innovations are now being studied? Describe the inservice-education program of the current year for those conducting this course (program).

5. What aspect of teaching in this course (program) evidences implementation of current thinking and recommendations with regard to how students acquire knowledge, comprehend important concepts, or demonstrate application of knowledge? How are students encouraged to become increasingly self-directive?

6. What provisions are made for movement of students to the next level of competency in this course (program)?

. . . . .

From the following CHECKLIST and EVALUATION, complete on this page only those which are appropriate to the course (program) that you are evaluating.

CHECKLIST

( ) 1. Continuous and developmental experiences relevant to the stated objectives have been developed in sequences for this course (program).

( ) 2. Instructional materials are varied and extensive, and equipment is up-to-date and being used.

( ) 3. Instruction is organized and procedures are used to provide for students of varying abilities and backgrounds.

( ) 4. Independent learning is encouraged.

( ) 5. Research projects and experimentation aimed at improvement have been organized and carried out.

( ) 6. Consideration has been given to current thinking as to how the most efficient and significant learning can be accomplished.

III. PROGRAM--continued

EVALUATION

[ ] a. To what extent does the conduct of the course (program) meet the objectives defined for it?

[ ] b. To what extent are the instructional procedures organized to meet the objectives?

[ ] c. To what extent are new instructional materials, experimentation, and utilization of new research findings used in this course (program)?

COMMENTS

IV. STAFF

DESCRIPTION (Select only those questions which are appropriate to describe the course or program. Use separate sheets to prepare your narrative answers and attach to this section.)

1. How many staff members conduct this course or program?

2. What preparation do the staff members conducting the course or program have for providing learning experiences related to the desired outcomes?

3. In what role or capacities are they currently engaged?

4. How much time do they have to prepare for their role with students? (For example, lesson planning, staff meetings, conferences.)

5. What provisions are made to work with individual students?

6. How do staff members keep themselves up to date on new practices (and content) in this field?

. . - . .

From the following CHECKLIST and EVALUATION, complete on this page only those which are appropriate to the course (program) that you are evaluating.

CHECKLIST

( ) 1. Staff members have the experience and preparation required to aid effectively in accomplishing the objectives of this program.

IV. STAFF-continued

CHECKLIST--continued

( ) 2. Staff are provided desirable working circumstances (work load, professional library, clerical help, preparation period) to do a good job.

( ) 3. Staff are encouraged to continue professional growth through travel, advanced training and research activity.

( ) 4. Staff keep themselves up to date on any new techniques and content.

( ) 5. Staff are involved in shaping and improving the program.

EVALUATION

[ ] a. How adequate is the professional preparation of the staff?

[ ] b. To what extent do the staff members demonstrate an understanding and ability to work with students enrolled in this course (program)?

COMMENTS

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

DESCRIPTION (Select only those questions which are appropriate to describe the course or program. Use separate sheets to prepare your narrative answers and attach to this section.)

1. What evaluation techniques have been developed to ascertain whether or not the objectives of this course (program) are being accomplished? Are these techniques relevant to the stated objectives?

2. What evidence is available to describe the extent to which the desired outcomes are being accomplished? Does students' achievement appear to be at about the level one would predict from their aptitude and ability levels?

3. What information or data are available describing the extent to which aptitudes, appreciations, interests or values are affected by instruction in course (program)?

4. What evidence is available on how well students who participated in this course (program) perform after leaving school?

. . . . .

V. EVALUATION TECHNIQUES--continued

From the following CHECKLIST and EVALUATION, complete on this page only those which are appropriate to the course (program) that you are evaluating.

CHECKLIST

( ) 1. Evaluation techniques relevant to the stated objectives are used.

( ) 2. Student achievement appears to be about at a level consistent with their aptitude.

( ) 3. Assessment is made of changes in students' values, attitudes, appreciations and interests.

( ) 4. Follow-up studies are conducted to determine post-school success in this area.

EVALUATION

[ ] a. To what extent is this course (program) consistent with the philosophy and objectives as stated in Section B, "Philosophy and Objectives"?

[ ] b. To what extent does this course (program) meet the needs of students described in Section C, "School and Community Profile"?

COMMENTS

VI. PROGRAMMING FOR IMPROVEMENT

A graphic picture of the school's overall performance emerges when the evaluation ratings from the preceding pages are transcribed onto the following Summary Table of Evaluation Ratings. The school will be able to see at a glance the highlights and outstanding features of the program evaluated in this section. Another major value to be gained from such a picture is that it spotlights the areas in need of strengthening and thus yields a useful guide to the planning of needed improvements.

Realistically speaking, it is rarely possible for ongoing programs to be subjected to a large number of simultaneous changes. It is, however, both possible and desirable to analyze the problems uncovered through the self-study and evaluation process, and to develop a timetable for tackling them. The process of classifying needed improvements in two phases, 1) those already under way or which will be undertaken in the very near future and 2) those which require longer-range planning, produces a program for change which can serve as an orderly guide for action.

VI. PROGRAMMING FOR IMPROVEMENT--continued

The questions which follow the summary table offer the opportunity for the school briefly to identify its outstanding features and its plans for improvement. They are also designed to assist the Commission on Accreditation to evaluate the school in terms of one of its governing principles: If deficiencies exist, the school is willing to remedy them, and gives evidence of being capable of effecting the needed remedies within a reasonable period of time.

It should be borne in mind that planning for improvements is not necessarily restricted to the weaker aspects of the school's program or administration. If changes are contemplated in areas which are already good or excellent in order to make them even better, these should not be overlooked when responding to the questions.

A. Summary Table of Evaluation Ratings

Transcribe each evaluation made in this section into the appropriate box on the following chart. Inspection of this chart will serve as a guide to consideration of areas for improvement.

Evaluation Questions	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Missing	Not Applicable
I. Objectives a.							
II. Pupil Information a.							
III. Program a.							
b.							
c.							
IV. Staff a.							
b.							
V. Evaluation Techniques a.							
b.							

VI. PROGRAMMING FOR IMPROVEMENT--continued

B. Summary of Highlights and Planned Improvements

1. What are the highlights or outstanding features of the course (program)?

2. What improvements are now under way, or will be undertaken in the very near future?

3. What improvements will require long-range planning, and when will this planning be undertaken?

NAME OF SCHOOL_____

Self-evaluation by_____

Date:_____

Appendix F

SUPPLEMENT TO Section A: "Manual of Procedures"
SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION GUIDE FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

The experience of staff members using the Self-Study and Evaluation Guide for Residential Schools identified certain areas where additional information seemed necessary to utilize the Guide most effectively in the self-study. This supplement was prepared to meet that need. The intent is to elaborate on information presented in "III. Conducting the Self-Study" of Section A: "Manual of Procedures."

General Suggestions for Effective Use of the Guide to Describe an Individual School

The great diversity among residential schools in population served and specific programs conducted makes it difficult to have a single instrument to fit each school's unique needs. The Guide should be viewed as a "guide" for describing the program of the school and the content should not be considered as equally applicable to all schools. The following suggestions may help the self-study subcommittee to individualize certain sections.

When Checklists and Evaluations are not appropriate, the subcommittee may elect to utilize one or more of the following procedures:

1. Use ? or X in coding Checklists and M or NA for coding Evaluations.

2. Use space under Comments to describe variation in the program of the school from that described in the items.

3. Attach additional materials to describe variations and reasons for the variations.

In certain sections, data are requested for tables which list specific grades. In those schools which are ungraded or do not have grades as such or combine several grades into a single unit, i.e., primary, subcommittee members should cross out the listing and substitute the description for the grouping which is appropriate to that school. The heading on any table in the Guide may be modified in order to make it more appropriate for describing that school. In addition, the subcommittee may substitute for any table a new table that will facilitate recording of data about the school.

It is difficult to obtain unanimity concerning how certain terms should be defined. This is especially true with such abstractions as "teacher-dictated," "self-discipline," "spiritual and moral values," "aesthetic sense," "sound ideals." Additionally, certain words, such as "in-service training" mean different things in different parts of the country. Staff members within any one school, however, should be in agreement with regard to the meaning of such terms particularly as they apply to outcomes and evaluations of the school program. If necessary for total staff agreement, subcommittees should elaborate under Comments how they define such terms at their particular school.

The Role of Residential Living in the Program of the School

There are different opinions among educators of the visually handicapped regarding the place of houseparents and others charged with responsibility for the after-school life of the student within the total school program. Some view the residential aspects as separate from the curricular program of the school itself; others view it as part of a totality inseparable from the school program. The National Accreditation Council's Committee on Accreditation of Educational Services, which advised concerning the development of the Guide, chose the latter point of view. Consequently, there is no separate section for the residential living part of the school's program. Rather, residential aspects are interwoven into various sections of the Guide.

While it is recommended that houseparents be involved in all parts of the self-study, their participation on subcommittees either as full members or as special consultants is especially appropriate and recommended for certain sections. These include: D-1: "General Curriculum Planning;" D-2: "Arts and Crafts;" D-5: "Daily Living Skills;" D-10: "Health Education;" D-11: "Home Economics;" D-15: "Orientation and Mobility;" D-16: "Physical Education;" E: "Student Activity Program;" G: "Pupil Personnel Services;" H: "Health and Safety Services;" I: "School Plant." The cooperative efforts of curricular and residential (non-curricular) school personnel in completing these sections will be directed toward presenting a more complete and accurate picture of the total school program.

Should schools wish to describe the residential aspects of their program separately, two alternatives are suggested: a narrative description may be prepared or Section D-20: "Other Course or Program" may be utilized.

Suggestions for Combining Sections

The experience of the first schools to use the Guide, particularly the smaller ones, showed the value of treating the material from two or more sections as a single unit and of having a single committee prepare certain related sections. Curricular programs and administrative functions tend to overlap in many schools, and combining sections may be appropriate in certain instances.

The following combinations of sections are suggested. Schools should feel free to combine others if they deem this procedure appropriate.

1. D-2: "Arts and Crafts: and D-12: "Industrial Arts (Secondary);" or D-12: "Industrial Arts (Secondary)" and D-19: "Vocational Trade and Industrial Education (Secondary)."

2. D-3: "Business Education (Secondary)," D-6: "Distributive Education (Secondary)" and/or D-19: "Vocational Trade and Industrial Education (Secondary)."

3. D-10: "Health Education" and D-16: "Physical Education."

4. D-5: "Daily Living Skills" and D-15: "Orientation and Mobility."

Suggestions for Combining Sections--continued

Schools wishing to combine sections may have one committee complete the two or more sections or they may select appropriate material from the two or more sections, extracting certain applicable items, thereby developing a "new" section.

In addition to the above curricular sections, schools may wish to utilize a single committee to prepare both Sections G: "Pupil Personnel Services" and H: "Health and Safety Services."

Miscellaneous

Two sections of the Guide should be viewed in a broad perspective by the subcommittees completing them. These are Section D-1: "General Curriculum Planning" and Section E: "Student Activity Program."

The seeming overlap is intentional in Section D-1. The purpose of this section is to describe the total curriculum of the school in broad terms as an overview; the remaining D-sections spell out for each curricular area the specifics which are introduced in this section. It should be viewed, therefore, as a summary or synthesis of all the following curricular sections.

The purpose of Section E: "Student Activity Program" is to describe non-curricular activities, that is, those that supplement curricular activities conducted during the school day. Many activities, such as music, art, creative writing, dramatics, etc. may be pursued by students both in school as a curricular area and outside of school as a student activity. The subcommittee should code items in this section as they pertain to the co-curricular aspects of the program. Because of the content presented in this section, involvement of houseparents in its preparation is especially recommended.

Schools offering home economics on the elementary level should utilize Section D-11, making appropriate revisions in the material presented and including under Comments descriptions of the program at this level.

A Final Note

As the movement toward greater client involvement in programming grows, residential schools should be alert to providing opportunities for their clientele, both parents and students, to be involved in planning and evaluating programs. Schools initiating a self-study may wish to consider the potential for gaining greater objectivity through meaningful involvement of board members, parents, older students and graduates as they study their program.

This material was prepared as a result of a study supported by a grant provided by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Project No. 8-8023.

National Accreditation Council for Agencies Serving the Blind and Visually Handicapped, 84 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10011.

8/69